enkins Goodman buman & Hamilton LLP 7 Montgomery St. 10th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94104 (415) 705-0400

	~ .
Jenkins Goodman	
Neuman & Hamilton	_
LLP	25
417 Montgomery St.	20
10 th Floor	
San Francisco, CA	
94104	-26
(415) 705-0400	

3.	A continuance is necessary in order to allow all parties to properly complete
	discovery and prepare for trial. Discovery in this matter is more complicated and is
	taking longer than anticipated by the parties. Discovery has already resulted in
	voluminous production and more is still expected. For example, Plaintiff UNITED
	STATES OF AMERICA ("United States") has produced eleven (11) digital discs
	containing over 435,000 separate files. Many of these files are multi-page files,
	including one that is 692 pages long. Additionally, many of these discs were only
	recently produced. Discs 7 and 8, which were produced in July, together contain
	more than 100,000 separate files, and Discs 9, 10 and 11, which were produced on
	August 15, 2008, contain over 85,000 files not including the files contained in Disc
	10. I am currently unable to open Disc 10 due to a defect in the way the
	information was saved onto the disc and do not know how many files are contained
	therein. However, the "properties" for that disc indicate it contains 2.84 GB of
	information.

- 4. Under the current schedule, the parties are unable to meaningfully evaluate these documents and are unable to conduct any necessary follow-up investigation and discovery. Furthermore, the parties require additional time so that they may obtain qualified experts and those experts may review all relevant materials.
- 5. All parties, including the United States, agree in principle to a continuance. Most have indicated that they agree to the particulars of this Motion. Counsel for Defendants CHI-HSIU HSIN and OPTECH LIMITED is preparing his own motion for an even longer continuance than the one sought herein and will not stipulate with regard to this Motion on the chance that doing so may prejudice his own motion.
- 6. If a continuance is not granted, the parties will not be able to properly prepare for

117 Montgomery St. 10th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 (415) 705-0400 26

trial. On the current schedule, the parties will be cut off from pursuing follow-up
discovery after eventually completing review of the produced documents. The
parties will be forced to select experts without the benefit of having fully reviewed
and analyzed the discovery materials. The experts will have to render opinions
based on partial discovery because there will have been no follow-up. The parties
will therefore suffer prejudice insofar as their respective trial preparations will be
abridged by these circumstances and they will be forced to try this matter with less
than full information and preparation

- 7. There have been no previous scheduling modifications in this case. The parties did submit a prior stipulation and proposed order modifying the scheduling order. The Court did not sign this order, however, based on its requirement that dispositive motions be heard at least 120 days before trial. Because the present Motion seeks to continue the trial date and all associated deadlines, if this continuance is granted, the deadline for hearing dispositive motions will still be at least 120 days before trial.
- 8. The parties are informed and believe that May 18, 2009 is a date to which the trial may be continued that is convenient for the Court as there is currently only one trial scheduled that week and the United States estimates that trial of the instant case will only last one week.
- 9. Continuing the trial date to Mary 18, 2009 will push the trial back by less than two months. This continuance would involve only a minimal disruption of the case schedule while allowing the parties to properly prepare for trial.
- 10. Due to the rapidly approaching trial date and related deadlines, I requested that the other parties stipulate that this motion be heard on shortened notice. All of the other parties have agreed that this Motion may be heard on shortened notice.

	Case 3:07-cv-04762-PJH Document 108 Filed 09/04/2008 Page 4 of 4
1	11. I believe that there is good cause for allowing this Motion to be heard on shortened
2	notice. This would allow the parties to better prepare for trial as they will not have
3	to wait as long to learn whether the Court will grant a continuance of the trial date
4	and related deadlines, all of which are rapidly approaching. The parties can then
5	plan their trial preparation accordingly.
6	
7	The foregoing is made under penalty of perjury this 3rd day of September 2008.
8	JENKINS GOODMAN NEUMAN & HAMILTON LLP
9	& HAWILTON ELF
10	By: /S/ Tom Prountzos
11	TOM PROUNTZOS Attorneys for ROBERT J. NAGY
12	Attorneys for ROBERT J. NACT
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
23 26	
20	-4-
	DECLARATION OF TOM PROUNTZOS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT

ROBERT J. NAGY'S MOTION TO CONTINUE TRIAL DATE

Jenkins Goodman Neuman & Hamilton LLP 417 Montgomery St. 10th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 (415) 705-0400